

AMENDMENT  
February 27, 2006

YOR920010699US1  
Serial No. 09/933,646

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 – 9 remain in the application and stand rejected. New claims 10 – 15 have been added and are supported by the specification. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amendments to the specification are formal in nature. No new matter has been added.

New claims 10 – 15 have been added and are supported by Figure 12 and the specification, page 19, lines 14 – 17. No reference of record shows or suggests an extranet monitor monitoring “incoming tuples for changes to the tuplespace data structure” as claims 10, 12 and 14 recite. Further, no reference of record shows or suggests such an extranet monitor using listeners to detect “changes to the tuplespace data structure and handling services for a corresponding” computer as claims 11, 13 and 15 recite. Accordingly, no reference of record teaches or suggests the present invention as recited in new claims 10 – 15. No new matter has been added. Independent consideration and allowance of new claims 10 – 15 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 – 6, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over published U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0004824 to Cuan et al. in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,377,950 to Peters et al. Claims 7 – 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of Cuan et al. and Peters et al. in further view of published U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0102524 to Rizzi et al. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Essentially repeating the prior rejection, it is asserted that Cuan et al., more or less, teaches the invention as recited in Claims 1 – 6, 8 and 9. Thus, with respect to claims 1, 8 and 9, it is asserted that Cuan et al. discloses the recited “tuplespace data structure” by (¶ 48 tuple data code for storing and transferring data in tuple data format) that identifies one or more server computers (¶ 48-50, web servers 304 and

# BEST AVAILABLE COPY

AMENDMENT  
February 27, 2006

YOR920010699US1  
Serial No. 09/933,646

production servers 312-316, a geographic location for each server computer (¶21 and ¶ 48-50), and authorized (¶ 68), password-protected shared data fields (¶ 48) made available through the network to create an extranet image (snapshot of a staging area located within development server is established ¶ 40-42; ¶ 27-29);....

As the applicants had previously noted, the Cuan et al. “development server 230 may ... include tuple code 242 for storing and transferring data in a tuple format. Tuple code may be a software application configured to deploy data.” Paragraph 0048. Further, the “staging application 244 can configure the template code and tuple code for displaying data on a website in a given template format.” *Id.* This does not teach or suggest: “a tuplespace data structure that identifies one or more server computers,” as claim 1 recites. Neither does Cuan et al. teach “a tuplespace data structure that identifies ... a geographic location for each server computer,” as claim 1 recites. In point of fact, nowhere else does Cuan et al. use the word “tuple,” which may be found only in paragraph 0048.

Regarding the assertion that the Cuan et al. “snapshot of a staging area located within development server is established” teaches and “authorized, password-protected shared data fields made available through the network to create an extranet image;” Cuan et al. paragraph 0040 recites that a “base table may be established in client database 140. The base table may be a snapshot of a staging area located within development server 104.” (emphasis added.) Thus, very clearly, snapshots may be in Cuan et al. client systems (e.g., 138), not in server 230. Since each Cuan et al. client may have a snapshot, multiple different snapshots may be established in multiple Cuan et al. clients for multiple different images. By contrast, for the recited extranet monitor, “shared data fields made available through the network” for creating an (i.e., a single instantaneous) extranet image. That it may be alleged that Cuan et al. mentions something that might be characterized as each of “one or more computers, a geographic location for each server computer, and authorized, password-protected shared data fields made available through the network to create an extranet image” is not the same as “a tuplespace data structure that identifies” the

AMENDMENT  
February 27, 2006

YOR920010699US1  
Serial No. 09/933,646

computers, a geographic location for each and shared data fields for creating an extranet image.

While acknowledging that Cuan et al. does not explicitly teach the data structure being a tuple data structure, the Office action cites Peters et al. to show that a tuple data structure “is well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Cuan et al., as evidenced by Peters” et al. However, Peters et al. still does not teach, and the combination of Cuan et al. with Peters et al. does not result in, “a tuplespace data structure that identifies” the computers, a geographic location for each and shared data fields for creating an extranet image.

Continuing traversal of the rejection of claims 1, 8 and 9, it is again asserted that the Cuan et al. “¶ 21, script software [that] allows the control and monitoring of data destinations of remote disparate systems” is “an extranet monitor software program that detects incoming messages from one or more requester server computers,” as recited by claim 1. However, controlling and monitoring data destinations of remote systems is not the same as monitoring incoming messages. Cuan et al. paragraph 0089, which teaches “the utilization of dedicated processors, webservers configured to receive and route browser requests, application servers, state servers and other types of computer processors configured to communicate amongst each other,” hardly teaches “determine[ing] a service required by the message” as the Office action asserts.

Similarly, regarding the assertion that Cuan et al. paragraphs 0048 – 51 teaches storing “a service request corresponding to the service in the tuplespace data structure along with the geographic location of the requester server computer and one or more destination server computer...,” that is not what Cuan et al. teaches. As noted hereinabove Cuan et al. paragraph 0048, which includes the only mention of “tuple” in Cuan et al., teaches “tuple code 242 for storing and transferring data in a tuple format. Tuple code may be a software application configured to deploy data.” Cuan et al. paragraph 0049,

AMENDMENT  
February 27, 2006

YOR920010699US1  
Serial No. 09/933,646

essentially, teaches a “production web server 304 [communicating] with production servers 312-316 which communicate with network 308.” Cuan et al. paragraph 0050 teaches transmission of content in one direction and feedback in the other. So, content is transmitted “from the development web server 302 to the ultimate web production servers 312-316 may be monitored and documented so that transactions and executed scripts can be analyzed.” *Id.* In the other direction, “[f]eedback information can be deployed in the feedback direction 320 so that an entity within the data path can analyze the entire deployment process as it occurs.” *Id.* Clearly, none of this describes “an extranet monitor ... [determining] a service required by the message, stores a service request corresponding to the service in the tuplespace data structure along with the geographic location of the requester server computer and ... destination server computers,” as claims 1, 8 and 9 recite. Accordingly, Cuan et al. does not teach or suggest the present invention as recited in claims 1, 8 and 9 and the addition of Peters et al. does not supply what is missing from Cuan et al. Therefore, the combination of Cuan et al. with Peters et al. does not result in the present invention as recited in claims 1, 8 and 9.

Furthermore, since dependent claims include all of the differences with the claims as the claims from which they depend, the combination of Cuan et al. with Peters et al. does not result in the present invention as recited in claims 2 – 6, which depend from claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 6, 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of Cuan et al. with Peters et al. is respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of claims 7 – 9 over Cuan et al. and Peters et al. in further combination with Rizzi et al., as previously noted, Rizzi et al. teaches a “content editing system allows developers of instructional materials to edit and design the instructional materials from a database of content.” Abstract. Rizzi et al. includes an editor that can edit XML documents, some of which may be educational curriculum. Paragraphs 0024 and 0061. Thus, Rizzi et al does not add anything to the teaching of Cuan et al. or Peters et

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

AMENDMENT  
February 27, 2006

YOR920010699US1  
Serial No. 09/933,646

al. to result in the present invention as recited in claims 1 – 6, much less claim 7 – 9 depending therefrom. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 7 – 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of Cuan et al. and Peters et al. with Rizzi et al. is respectfully requested.

The applicants thank the Examiner for efforts both past and present in examining the application. Believing the Application in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above, the applicants request that the Examiner consider new claims 10 – 15, reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1 – 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and allow the Application to issue.

Should the Examiner believe anything further may be required, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number listed below for a telephonic or personal interview to discuss any other changes.

Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 50-0510 and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully Submitted,



Charles W. Peterson, Jr.  
Registration No. 34,406

February 27, 2006  
(Date)

Customer No. 33233  
Law Office of Charles W. Peterson, Jr.  
11703 Bowman Green Dr,  
Suite 100  
Reston, VA 20190  
Telephone: (703) 481-0532  
Facsimile: (703) 481-0585